EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

hunter communications law group



RECEIVED

VIA HAND DELIVERY

SEP 25 2000

September 25, 2000

HEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS SOMMUSEA.

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 - 12th Street, S.W. TW-A325 Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte Presentation in CC Docket No. 96-98

Dear Ms. Salas:

Today the undersigned, accompanied by David A. Gusky and Stephen D. Trotman, Executive Vice President and Vice President - Industry Relations, respectively, of the Association of Communications Enterprises ("ASCENT"), met with Kyle Dixon, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Michael Powell, to discuss ASCENT's Petition for Reconsideration of the Commission's *Third Report and Order* in CC Docket No. 96-98. The attached materials were distributed at that meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles C. Hunter

Attachment

No. of Copies rec'd OH / List A B C D E

1620 I Street, N.W. Suite 701 Washington, D.C. 20006 Telephone (202) 293-2500 Facsimile (202) 293-2571



The Three Line Cap

A Smaller Carrier Perspective: Lost Opportunity, Lost Benefits, Lost Cause

Lost Opportunity

- 3

- Four years following enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CLECs provide only four percent of local loops; less than a quarter of the four percent are provided using unbundled loops, with an even smaller percentage being associated with self-provisioned switching
- Wholesale margins are too low to provide a viable long term competitive opportunity, and may well decline in the wake of the Eighth Circuit's most recent proclamations
- Unbundled local switching is only available from incumbent LECs; switch-based CLECs rarely offer local switching on an unbundled basis
- The UNE-Platform provides smaller CLECs with a viable opportunity to compete; TELRIC pricing, in conjunction with access revenues, generally produces workable margins at least for business customers
- The UNE-Platform allows smaller CLECs to achieve the customer and revenue thresholds necessary to support switch acquisition

Lost Benefits

- Small businesses have historically been the last to benefit from telecommunications competition; small carriers have traditionally targeted this under-served market
- Businesses using four to twenty lines constitute the large majority of small business telecommunications customers and a substantial percentage of all business customers
- Switch-based CLECs target businesses capable of supporting high-capacity arrangements (i.e., twenty or more lines); among ASCENT's members, the average number of lines-per-customer provided by CLECs using the UNE-Platform ranges between the single digits and the low teens

- It is not economical to use self-provisioned switching to serve multi-line business customers who cannot support high-capacity arrangements; because costs are incurred on a per-loop basis, provisioning multiple DS-0 loops renders the provision of service to small business customers unprofitable
- EELs constitute a significant cost component for CLECs migrating to selfprovisioned switching
- Lack of access to unbundled local switching diminishes service quality and timeliness for small business customers

Lost Cause

- 3

- The Commission correctly determined that lack of access to unbundled local switching materially impairs a CLEC's ability to provide local service by raising costs, causing delays, and limiting the scope and quality of service offerings
- The Commission was correct in concluding that the mere presence of a handful of CLEC switches in a given market does not alter this impairment analysis
- The Three-Line Cap cannot be squared with the Commission's impairment determinations, because the economics of serving a three-line customer do not differ materially from the economics of serving a five, eight, twelve, etc.-line customer; non-recurring provisioning costs are incurred on a loop-by-loop basis
- Expansion of the geographic area within which a line cap would apply would be inconsistent with the Commission's impairment analysis, as well as market realities